DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 243 RC 008 690

AUTHOR Uhlmann, Julie M.
TITLE Boundary Maintenance in the Urban Environment: The Papago Case.
PUB DATE 23 Nov 74
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association (73rd, Mexico City, November 23, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; *Cultural Pluralism; Drinking; Economically Disadvantaged; Employment; Health; Historical Reviews; Housing; *Institutional Role; Racial Segregation; Recreational Activities; *Social Structure; Theories; *Urban Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Papagos; Tucson

ABSTRACT

In an effort to promote an evolutionary view of culture, the Tucson Papago society was examined in terms of Fredrick Barth's theory that: (1) an ethnic group may be involved in complex institutional sharing and still maintain its identity; (2) there is a structuring of interaction in institutional sharing such that each group is defined by the sharing; and (3) a common culture is a result of structured institutional sharing. Papago patterns of institutional sharing with the dominant society were traced from 1687 to the present, and current examples of "adaptations" of institutional sharing were identified. Specific areas examined were: (1) the Community Economic Opportunity and the Tucson Indian Center (examples of reinforced social hierarchy); (2) the employment hierarchy (institutionalized poverty); (3) housing (systematic constraints acting to keep the Papago in the low rent area of South Tucson); (4) the Public Health Service (a facility serving the Papago precisely because they are Papago and, therefore, eligible); (5) entertainment (in the form of drinking in bars owned by Anglos). Evidence indicated that an ethnic group may be involved in complex institutional sharing with a dominant group and still maintain its identity and that this socio-cultural group can be defined to a large extent by its participation in mainstream institutions. (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110243

Quotation of isolated portions (not exceeding four lines) for purposes of review or news articles is permitted. All other rights are reserved by the author and other quotations may not be made without written consent of the author.

Permission granted to ERIC
25-04-75

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BOUNDARY MAINTENANCE IN THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT: THE PAPAGO CASE

BY

Julie M. Uhlmann
University of Wyoming

Paper delivered at the 73rd annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Mexico City, November 23, 1974.

AC 008690

BOUNDARY MAINTENANCE IN THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT: THE PAPAGO CASE

INTRODUCTION

It is probably true that to a good extent we anthropologists expect Native Americans to vanish as a distinct group in the urban environment. The belief that contact between a technologically more advanced and organizationally more complex socio-cultural group and a technologically and organizationally less developed group (i.e., "primitive", "tribal", "underdeveloped") will lead to the eventual assimilation of the subordinate group is well entrenched in the field of anthropology. This belief has guided much anthropological research and theory both past and present.

In the past, the assimilative hypothesis motivated many anthropological studies of the contact situation during the early days of acculturation studies (Bohannon 1967:xiv-xv). Anthropologists desired to document "vanishing cultures" in the fear that much of the subject matter of anthropology would soon be gone. This, of course, did not happen. The subject matter did not disappear, it simply changed. In place of the study of small isolated societies, we now deal with socio-cultural groups which are characterized by complex institutional sharing with other socio-cultural groups. It is interesting that in his 1935 critique of the Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation Bateson (1967:192-93) foresaw this situation when he pointed out that the end result of culture contact which involved the assimilation of one group by another was hardly worth the study. He felt it was far more likely that two groups would persist in some kind of dynamic equilibrium.

More recently, Bohannon (1967:xvi) has pointed out that anthropologists are now faced with the study of nationalism which has replaced colonialism, of modernizing third world cultures, and with such phenomena within our own country as civil rights movements. In each of these instances the original subordinate, "less developed" group has changed and extended its relationships considerably. With specific reference to the Papago, Hackenberg (1968:11) states that to call the present day social organization of the Papago, which involves a blend of institutions from Indian and non-Indian

sources, "assimilative" is to misunderstand its nature. The social organization, rather, involves new forms and thus is truly evolutionary.

Inspite of these caveats, the basic premise of assimilation is still found in present studies of urban Indians. The assumption that the assimilation of Native Americans is an ongoing process (particularly rapid in the urban environment) which will lead to their eventual absorption by the dominant Anglo mainstream culture has guided much anthropological research and theory as well as governmental policy. For example, studies of urban Indians frequently stress "adjustment" defined in terms of the acceptance of mainstream goals and values such as economic self sufficiency, full employment, a positive valuation of formal education, future time orientation, etc. The logical extension of this point of view is the idea that with increasing contact in the urban environment Native American culture will disappear. The BIA's Relocation Program is an example of a governmental policy which is based on the assumption that contact will lead to assimilation. This, of course, has not happened. Even in situations of complex institutional sharing such as obtain in the urban environment, ethnic groups do manage to keep their identity. Thus we see increasing references in the literature to constructs such as "boundary maintenance", "culture broker", or "cultural pluralism".

The problem is that we need to relate some of the current analytical constructs we are developing to more general acculturation theory. Of particular issue is the conceptualization of culture. As anthropologists we have been much influenced by the Redfieldian intellectual tradition of viewing the cultures we study as self-contained, isolated, behaviorally and culturally homogeneous units. The logical extension of this point of view is the idea that with contact "culture" disappears as the self-contained unit ceases to exist. Basically this is the type of thinking which underlies the assimilative point of view. But this is a very static way of viewing culture. It is far more fruitful to draw on our heritage of evolutionary thinking in anthropology and view culture as constantly changing and evolving.

How then is this more evolutionary view to be accomplished? How are we to analyze socio-cultural groups which are characterized by complex institutional sharing, such as the Tucson Papago? Frederik Barth (1969) presents a strategy which is particularly relevant. I should like to analyze the Tucson Papago in terms of this strategy.

Barth (1969:9-17) makes three important assertations.

1. First, an ethnic group may be involved in complex institutional sharing and still maintain its identity. It is not geographical or social isolation per se which are the critical factors in substaining cultural diversity.
2. Secondly, this occurs because there is a structuring of interaction in institutional sharing such that each group is defined by the sharing. That is, there is an implicit set of rules governing inter-ethnic encounters. These rules allow for articulation in some domains of activity and proscribe inter-ethnic interaction in others. Some social relations and institutions are even based entirely on dichotomized ethnic statuses.
3. Thirdly, a common culture is a result of structured institutional sharing. In other words, according to Barth, the ethnic group defines the culture rather than the culture defining the ethnic group. This is a far more dynamic and evolutionary view that allows for the fact that culture does not cease to exist when traditional patterns are not exactly replicated. Rather, new forms develop.

I would now like to analyze the Tucson Papago in terms of Barth's strategy. Specifically, it will be shown that the urban Papago group both historically and in the present has been defined as an ethnic group and has maintained its boundaries by virtue of the nature of its institutional sharing with the dominant society in Tucson.

HISTORY OF THE TUCSON PAPAGO COMMUNITY

In aborginal times, the Papago were but one of several subgroups of a larger cultural and linguistic entity known as Pimans by the Spanish. The first intensive European contact with the Pimans was made by Father Eusebio Kino, a Jesuit missionary, who first entered the territory in 1687. The Pimans who were designated as Papagos

by Father Kino inhabited roughly 200 miles of desert between the Gila River and the Altar Valley in Mexico.

In 1731 a permanent mission was established approximately ten miles from Tucson at San Xavier del Bac. Cattle, sheep, goats, and most importantly wheat were introduced to the Indians. The Pimans along the Gila River in possession of a secure water supply could take advantage of the introduction of wheat to establish a two-crop farming system. Maize was the major summer crop and wheat was the winter crop. Thus the Pimans in this area (present day Pima Indians) greatly expanded their agriculture. The site of Tucson itself also became more important after the time of Father Kino. The rich lands and mines near Tucson drew Spanish settlers to the area (Tooker 1952:5).

The effect of the expansion of agriculture by the Pimas along the Gila River and increasing Spanish settlement in the area was to draw the Pimans known as Papagos to the Tucson area. The Pimas employed the Papagos as laborers in their fields, and the Spaniards employed the Papagos in Tucson as domestics and laborers at odd jobs.

At first the Papago presence in Tucson was seasonal and migratory. Papagos would come to Tucson for the winter and build temporary structures in the southern outskirts of Tucson. This adaptation of seasonal migration was facilitated by an aboriginal pattern of migration which was an integral part of Papago life. Specifically, field villages, where crops could be grown by catching runoff water from the hills or from cloudbursts, were occupied during the summer months. Well villages, which were located in the hills by natural springs, were occupied in the winter. During this time, Papago gained their subsistence by hunting and gathering (Hoover 1935:258). With the onset of the Apache wars, the Papagos also moved in and out of defense villages (Hoover 1935:262).

The United States acquired Tucson as a result of the Gadsen Purchase in 1853. Troops were first sent to Tucson in 1856; and from that date on, Anglos arrived in great numbers. With the establishment of American rule and the cessation of the Apache wars in the late 1870's the Papago settlement in Tucson began to prosper and grow. Although the original settlement in Tucson was seasonal, by the early 1900's a more permanent Papago settlement in south Tucson began to develop. This was facilitated by the fact that land

developers bought up and subdivided land on which the Papagos were camping. Lots were sold to displaced Indians at reduced prices; and two small Indian subdivisions date from this period (circa 1903). By the time of the First World War, the outlines of the present Papago community were fairly well established (Arizona Commission of Indian Affairs 1957:40).

By 1902, 344 Papagos were enumerated in Tucson (Tooker 1952: 13-14). In 1960, 1005 were enumerated as part of the census which established the Papago Population Register. This represents the approximate size of the Papago population today.

Inspite of the increasing stability of the Papago population in Tucson, their basic position in Tucson society has not changed. They are located physically in the south of the city. They are employed at the lower levels of the economic heirarchy as domestics, laborers, or at odd jobs. One should note from this brief historical review that this pattern of institutional sharing with the dominant society (be they Spanish, Pima Indian, or anglo) was set at the time of the first Spanish settlement in the Tucson area and has continued to exist until the present (Tooker 1952:7,15; Arizona Commission of Indian Affairs 1957:44-45; Uhlmann 1973:188).

PRESENT DAY ADAPTATIONS

Presently Papagos are still located in the south of Tucson. The greatest concentration is in the city of South Tucson which is a small incorporated city of approximately one square mile in the midst of Tucson proper to the south of the downtown area. In 1972, approximately 50 percent of the Tucson Papago population was living here.

Tucson society is multi-ethnic and hierarchical. At the top of the social hierarchy are the Anglos, then Chicanos, then Chinese, followed at a greater distance by Blacks, Papagos, and Yaquis. Although Blacks, Papagos, and Yaquis are found at the bottom of the hierarchy, the social distance between these groups is not as great as that between the other groups (Tooker 1952:36). To be a Papago in Tucson, therefore, means for most individuals to be defined as "poor", "Indian", and "Papago". There are a number of examples of institutional sharing which act to define this status by virtue of the structuring of social interactions. I would like to discuss some of these.

Reinforcing the Social Hierarchy

The Community Economic Opportunity (CEO) organization, the local office of the OEO, is one organization of the larger Tucson community which acts to define the Tucson Papago as "poor", "Indian", and "Papago". The CEO at the time of my fieldwork in Tucson had institutional connections with the Papago community primarily because it funded the Tucson Indian Center. The center itself is a good example of boundary maintenance. The Tucson Indian Center theoretically caters to the total Indian population of Tucson, but in effect is a Papago center. The building is owned by several Papagos. In addition, non-Papagos who come to the center are made to feel uncomfortable by informal sanctions such as gossip and teasing. The Tucson Indian Center was also in frequent difficulty with the CEO because it did not have the aggressive community programs which the funding agency felt it should have. Organizers from the CEO complained about the lack of drive and carry through on programs by the Indians who staffed the center.

To return to the question of how the CEO acts to define the Tucson Papago as "poor", "Indian", and "Papago", it should be noted that in the first place the very existence of the CEO depends upon the continuation of the category "poor" in the total urban society. The Tucson Indian Center receives funds from CEO precisely because Indians are poor.

Secondly, CEO acts to define and maintain the category "poor Indian" by implicit rules of exclusion. Both Blacks and Chicanos hold staff positions in this poverty agency which is supposed to hire only the indigent. No Indians had staff positions while I was in Tucson! Thus Indians receive the services of CEO but are excluded from the staff, which theoretically should include them, and thereby have their position in the Tucson social heirarchy reinforced.

Lastly, the category "Papago" is defined by institutional sharing with CEO because the Tucson Indian Center is censured for being controlled by Papagos and not allowing other Indians into its organization. It is also frequently in trouble for not being aggressive enough in its program organization.

Another example of institutional sharing which defines and reinforces the position of the Papago within the social hierarchy has been given by Kelly (1971) who observed the organization and presentation of the Fiesta of Mission San Xavier del Bac, the original Spanish mission ten miles from Tucson. Participants in the fiesta are Anglo, Chicano, Papago, and Yaqui. Kelly (1971) found that members of these ethnic groups occupied roles of parallel status to their status in the wider Tucson social structure. For example, the organization is done almost exclusively by the Anglo Tucson elite.

I made the same observation with regard to Papago participation in Tucson Rodeo Days. This celebration, which is planned and coordinated by Anglos, features a Papago Village which is set up in one of the local parks. Again, the Papagos are involved in institutional sharing in the celebration, but the nature of their involvement distinguishes them as "Papago".

Employment

The Papago are also defined as an ethnic group by virtue of their position in the employment hierarchy. As mentioned previously, since the Spanish first settled in the Tucson area, Papagos have been hired for jobs in the lower employment brackets. The traditional employment for Papagos over the years has been as farm laborers, domestics, yardworkers, and unskilled laborers. This situation still obtains (Stull 1973:14; Uhlmann 1973:147,188). Tooker (1952:37) is of the opinion that one of the reasons for the fact that there is a limited Anglo lower class in Tucson is the abundant supply of cheap Mexican and Indian labor which has always been available. Thus the existence of the lower class Indian group has been and is vital to the interests of the dominant group. One might easily view this as a case of institutionalized poverty.

As modern life becomes more and more technical, domestics and unskilled laborers are less in demand. It is interesting to reflect on the effect this will have on individuals presently occupying these jobs. Occupationally displaced persons could either become unemployed or be retained at a higher skill level. The second possibility appears to be occurring with the Tucson Papago. Both Stull (1973:9) and I (Uhlmann 1973:188) found a rise in skill level

from 1960 to 1972. However, one may still question whether or not this improves the position of the Papago within the employment hierarchy. Does this mean that the Papago are being assimilated to the dominant society? It is not at all certain that the answer to this question will be in the affirmative. With increasing technology, each step of the employment hierarchy may simply move up a step so that the deprived are not as deprived as they were formerly, but are nevertheless in the same relative position. One might argue, for example, that the occupations of nurse's aide or hospital orderly, which Papagos are trained for at present, are but updated versions of the domestic or yardworker.

In any case, it is obvious that there are strong barriers to upward mobility within the urban employment hierarchy for the Papago. They are most frequently found in the positions of domestics and unskilled laborers. They rarely rise above the level of the unskilled trades. They have held this position in relation to other ethnic groups in Tucson since the Spanish settled in the area. Thus one has to conclude that the implicit rules of the urban social setting allow for articulation in only certain levels of the employment hierarchy and proscribe interaction in others.

Housing

Institutional sharing with the dominant society which acts to define the Papago is also illustrated with reference to housing. Historically, Papagos have been located in south Tucson. Dating from the time of the subdivisions in the early 1900's, some Papagos own lots and houses in this area. Most people, however, rent. Their residence in this particular area of Tucson to some extent acts to define the Papago in that it is the area of greatest Papago population concentration in the city.

In addition, there are various systematic constraints in the urban setting which act to keep the Papago in this physical location. Specifically, rents are more commensurate with Papago incomes in this area. Even at that, rents in south Tucson are amazingly high given the quality of housing. One can understand this situation with reference to the situation of the urban poor. In the first place, these people lack the knowledge and transportation to look in other areas of the city. Secondly, rents in a popular winter tourist area

such as Tucson are high; so that rents in south Tucson, a less desirable area of the city, are low in comparison. All of these factors act to increase the scarcity of housing in south Tucson which in turn drives rents up. Purchasing housing in other areas of Tucson would, of course, be beyond the financial means of most Papagos in Tucson.

Health Care

Although there is a county hospital and neighborhood health clinic in the immediate area of south Tucson, the Papagos prefer to use the Public Health Service clinic located at San Xavier, ten miles from Tucson. This Public Health Service facility is a good example of institutional sharing which is based specifically on dichotomized ethnic statuses (i.e., Indian - non Indian). Through this facility Papagos receive the benefits of modern health care. However, they are eligible for this service precisely because they are Indian. In addition, the Public Health Service at San Xavier keeps computerized records on the total Papago poulation. This is indeed a defining activity!

Tucson Papagos have also been explicitly defined by the relationship with the Public Health Service facility at San Xavier in that the urban population has alternatively been eligible, ineligible, and then eligible again for health care at San Xavier. These changes instatus were the occasion for much concern and a degree of banding together to deal with the problem on the part of the Tucson Papago population (Arizona Commission of Indian Affairs 1957:54-69). For its part, the Public Health Service facility at San Xavier would not exist if it were not for the local Papago population.

Entertainment

The bars provide the major form of entertainment in the south Tucson area. There is a line of them between the downtown area extending through the city of South Tucson. However, there are usually only one or two of these bars which are favored by the Papago population and which are well known to all - including the police. A live band which plays Papago music is frequently featured in these bars. People of all ages go to drink, play pool, and dance to the music which is a kind of Mexican cantina music. The "Papago bars", however, are owned by Anglos. Again, an example of sharing

in the institutions of the city in such a way as to reinforce ethnic identity.

CONCLUSION

The evidence supports the hypothesis that an ethnic group may be involved in complex institutional sharing with a technologically and organizationally dominant group and still maintain its identity. In conclusion, I would like to relate this finding to the conceptualization of culture and to the persistence of ethnic groups in complex societies.

Granted that a group may maintain its ethnic identity in a situation of institutional sharing, does this mean that it also maintains a common culture? Tooker (1952:32-33) states that there is no distinct Tucson Papago culture precisely because of the sharing with both reservation and urban institutions. This is the common assimilative point of view, of course. Barth (1969:11), on the other hand, suggests that a common culture is a result of ethnic group organization which, in turn, is a result of structured institutional sharing. Again I would like to emphasize the fact that this type of analysis allows for a more dynamic, evolutionary conceptualization of culture. Culture from this point of view is constantly being created, constantly changing. Ethnic groups and their culture do not vanish in the urban environment.

I would also like to note that given the institutional sharing model of a socio-cultural group, the persistence of the group depends on the rigidity in the rules for inter-ethnic interaction, but not necessarily on the patterns of recruitment or ascription to the ethnic group. Thus ethnic groups are primarily categories of ascription and identification by the actors themselves which have the characteristic of organizing interaction between people (Barth 1969:10,21). The specific composition of the group is of secondary importance.

To give a specific example, in 1960 28.8 percent of the Tucson Papagos were of mixed ancestry; whereas in 1972 48.6 percent were of mixed ancestry. One could interpret this trend as leading to the breakdown of ethnic boundaries and greater assimilation into the mainstream society. However, given the point of view that ethnic groups are categories of ascription and identification by the actors themselves and are defined by the rules governing inter-ethnic

encounters, this does not necessarily follow. In the first place, there are Blacks and other Indians who are defined as "Papago" by the Papago community in Tucson. Primarily these are individuals who are integrated into the Papago community by marriage or other close affiliation. In addition, as is abundantly clear from the examples given in this paper, there are certain rules governing inter-ethnic encounters between the Tucson Papago and the dominant society. Thus corresponding changes in the relative position and diffusion of the Tucson Papago within the social hierarchy would have to be documented before one could assert that unqualified assimilation is occurring. Presently, the Tucson Papago form a distinct socio-cultural group which can be defined to a good extent by an analysis of their participation in the institutions of the mainstream Tucson society.

REFERENCES

Arizona Commission of Indian Affairs
1957 Program and Proceedings of the Arizona Commission of Indian Affairs, 1957. The Off-Reservation Papagos. Mimeographed.

Barth, Frederik, Ed.
1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Bateson, Gregory S.
1967 Culture Contact and Schismogenesis. In Beyond the Frontier: Social Process and Cultural Change. Paul Bohannon and Fred Plog, Eds. Garden City, New York: The Natural History Press, pp. 187-98.

Bohannon, Paul
1967 Introduction. In Beyond the Frontier: Social Process & Cultural Change. Paul Bohannon and Fred Plog, Eds. Garden City, New York: The Natural History Press, pp. xi-xviii.

Hackenberg, Robert A.
1968 Cultural Microevolution in a Southwest Indian Community. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Seattle, 1968. Mimeographed.

Hoover, J.W.
1935 Generic Descent of the Papago Villages. American Anthropologist 37:258-264.

Kelly, Marsha C.
1971 Las Fiestas Como Reflejo del Orden Social: el Caso de San Xavier del Bac. America Indigena 31:141-161.

Stull, Donald
1973 The Tucson Papago: An Historic and Demographic Overview. Unpublished Manuscript.

Tooker, Elizabeth
1952 Papagos in Tucson: An Introduction to Their History, Community Life, and Acculturation. M.A. Thesis, University of Arizona.

Uhlmann, Julie M.
1973 The Impact of Urbanization of the Fertility Behavior of Papago Indian Women. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Colorado.